



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/454,515	12/06/1999	MAGNUS M. LONNROTH	50277-312(OI	3831

29989 7590 05/19/2003

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP  
1600 WILLOW STREET  
SAN JOSE, CA 95125

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CHAU T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2142

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2003

12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/454,515

Applicant(s)

LONNROTH ET AL.

Examiner

Chau Nguyen

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 February 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 6. 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.
2. Since this application is eligible for the transitional procedure of 37 CFR 1.129(a), and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(r) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action is hereby withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.129(a). Applicant's amendment submission after final filed on 02/19/2003 has been entered.
3. Claims 1-35 are presented for examination.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2142

5. Claims 1-5, 8-11, 14-17, 21-24, 27-30, and 33-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagatomo et al. (Nagatomo), Patent No. 6,334,126, and further in view of Lincke et al. (Lincke), Patent No. 6,397,259.

6. As to claim 1, Nagatomo discloses a method for retrieving information from one or more data sources, the method including the steps of:

receiving, from a particular type of client, a request for a service (col. 6, lines 20-24);

wherein said request for said service is received at a system located separately from said client (col. 5, lines 61-63);

wherein said request is sent by a particular user (col. 6, lines 20-24);

wherein said first set of parameters includes identity of said service (col. 8, lines 5-9);

said system transmitting requests to one or more data sources (col. 5, lines 54-63 and col. 10, lines 4-44);

at said system receiving responses to said requests from the one or more data sources in one or more formats other than a particular format (col. 8, lines 11-57);

at said system converting the responses into said particular format (col. 10, line 30 – col. 11, line 35);

at said system generating, based on the responses, a composite response document in said particular format (col. 10, line 30 – col. 11, line 35);

Art Unit: 2142

at said system transforming the composite response document into a client-formatted response based on a second set of parameters (col. 6, lines 49-53, col. 7, lines 4-57, and col. 8, line 58 – col. 9, line 7);

wherein said second set of parameters includes identity of said particular type of client (col. 6, lines 49-53, col. 7, lines 4-57, and col. 8, line 58 – col. 9, line 7); and

at said system transmitting said client-formatted response to said particular user (col. 6, lines 49-53, col. 7, lines 4-57, and col. 8, line 58 – col. 9, line 7, col. 10, line 30 – col. 11, line 35);

However, Nagatomo does not disclose said system generating, based on a first set of parameters, a request object. In the same field of endeavor, Lincke discloses transmitting a first message (request) in packets of data from a client to a server, transforming the first message into a standard object data request, and transmitting the standard object data request to the source of data (col. 5, lines 9-65). Since Lincke teaches a wireless communications system providing packet minimized communications between a wireless client and a proxy server, which is similar to a process of a communication terminal when a search requester requests a search for information in a database and the search result is returned to the search requesting communication terminal of Nagatomo, thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Lincke and Nagatomo to include generating a request object based on a set of parameters. Lincke suggests that generating a request object to represent a form used for querying web server.

7. As to claims 2 and 5, Nagatomo and Lincke (Nagatomo-Lincke) disclose the steps of embedding within said request object one or more filtering criteria, and filtering data from said composite response document based on said filtering criteria prior to transforming said composite response document (Lincke, col. 5, lines 9-65).

8. As to claim 3, Nagatomo-Lincke disclose wherein one of said requests invokes a search mechanism at a data source based on a first set of search criteria (Nagatomo, col. 2, lines 9-34 and col. 7, line 55 – col. 8, line 17); and

the step of filtering data includes filtering data that originated from said data source based on a second set of search criteria (Nagatomo, col. 2, lines 9-34 and col. 7, line 55 – col. 8, line 17).

9. As to claim 4, Nagatomo-Lincke disclose wherein said first set of parameters for generating the request object includes identity of the particular user (Nagatomo, col. 6, lines 49-58, col. 7, line 15 – col. 8, line 63).

10. As to claim 8, Nagatomo-Lincke disclose the one or more data sources include a first data source that supports a first protocol and is accessible through a first gateway, and a second data source that supports a second protocol and is accessible through a second gateway (Nagatomo, col. 18, lines 25-67; Lincke, col. 9, lines 30-47, col. 11, lines 8-25 and col. 14, lines 48-64);

and the step of converting the responses into the particular format includes the first gateway converting a response from the first data source to the particular format; and the second gateway converting a response from the second data source to the particular format (Nagatomo, col. 18, lines 25-67; Lincke, col. 9, lines 30-47, col. 11, lines 8-25 and col. 14, lines 48-64).

11. As to claim 9, Nagatomo-Lincke disclose at least one of the first data source and the second data source is a database system (Nagatomo, Abstract, and col. 4, lines 48-52).

12. As to claim 10, Nagatomo-Lincke disclose at least one of the first data source and the second data source is an HTTP server (Nagatomo, col. 18, lines 49-59).

13. As to claim 11, Nagatomo-Lincke disclose the client-formatted response is an HTML document (Nagatomo, col. 18, lines 49-59).

14. As to claim 14, Nagatomo-Lincke disclose the particular type of client is a mobile phone (Lincke, col. 1, lines 30-47).

15. As to claim 15, Nagatomo-Lincke disclose the steps of receiving data that indicates user-specific customizations to services (Nagatomo, col. 7, line 15 – col. 8, line 17);

Art Unit: 2142

storing the data in a configuration database (Nagatomo, col. 5, lines 55-60);  
searching the configuration database for the user-specific customizations in response to receiving the request for the service (Nagatomo, col. 6, lines 49-58);  
the first set of parameters used to generate the request object includes the user-specific customizations (Nagatomo, col. 8, lines 5-10).

16. As to claim 16, Nagatomo-Lincke disclose wherein said one or more data sources include

a first web site accessible through a gateway (Lincke, col. 9, lines 30-47, col. 11, lines 8-25 and col. 14, lines 48-64), and

a second web site accessible through the gateway (Lincke, col. 9, lines 30-47, col. 11, lines 8-25 and col. 14, lines 48-64); and

the step of converting said responses into said particular format includes

gateway converting a first response from the first web site to the particular format (Lincke, col. 13, lines 11-17); and

said gateway converting a second response from the second web site to said particular format (Lincke, col. 13, lines 11-17).

17. Claims 17, 21-24, 27-30, and 33-35 are system and computer-readable medium claims containing similar limitations as the method discussed in claims 1-5, 8-11, and 14-16 above; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.



Art Unit: 2142

18. Claims 6-7, 12-13, 18-20, 25-26, and 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagatomo and Lincke as discussed in claims 1-5, 8-11, 14-17, 21-24, 27-30, and 33-35 above, and further in view of Bayeh et al. (Bayeh), Patent No. 6,012,098.

19. As to claim 6, Nagatomo-Lincke disclose the step of receiving responses to said requests from said one or more data sources in one or more formats other than a particular involves receiving responses to said requests from the one or more data sources in one or more formats other than XML (Nagatomo, col. 14, line 31 – col. 16, line 9);

the step of transforming the composite response document into a client-formatted response involves transforming the composite response document into a format other than XML (Nagatomo, col. 14, line 31 – col. 16, line 9);

However, Nagatomo-Lincke do not disclose the step of converting said responses into the particular format involves converting responses into XML and the step of generating a composite response document in the particular format involves generating a composite response document in XML. In the same field of endeavor, Bayeh discloses data servlet formats query results (from a database) to an Extensible Markup Language (XML) (Abstract, col. 8, lines 3-29 and Figs. 4&5). Since Bayeh discloses a system for retrieving data and converting it to a compatible format of a requesting device, which is similar to the systems for performing conversion and edition on search result in accordance with ability, function, and/or capacity of the

Art Unit: 2142

communication terminal of Nagatomo-Lincke, thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Nagatomo-Lincke and Bayeh to include the step of converting said responses into the particular format involves converting responses into XML and the step of generating a composite response document in the particular format involves generating a composite response document in XML. Bayeh suggests that the proposed technique enables additional data retrieval or formatting implementations to be quickly and easily added into the computing environment, which will provide greater flexibility in the manner in which data can be presented, and which may also increase overall system throughput and alleviate potential processing bottlenecks.

20. As to claim 7, Nagatomo-Lincke and Bayeh (Nagatomo-Lincke-Bayeh) disclose wherein the step of transforming includes: identifying one or more XSL stylesheets based on said second set of parameters (Bayeh, col. 4, line 23 – col. 5, line 2 and col. 12, lines 16-36); and

applying said one or more XSL stylesheets to said composite response document (Bayeh, col. 8, line 64 – col. 9, line 24).

21. As to claim 12, Nagatomo-Lincke-Bayeh disclose wherein the step of generating a request object involves generating an XML request document that includes unresolved links (Nagatomo, col. 19, lines 7-19 and col. 19, line 59 – col. 20, line 15); and

Art Unit: 2142

the step of transmitting requests involves resolving said unresolved links (Nagatomo, col. 19, lines 7-19 and col. 19, line 59 – col. 20, line 15).

22. As to claim 13, Nagatomo-Lincke-Bayeh disclose wherein the step of generating said composite response document involves replacing said unresolved links in said XML request document with XML data generated based on said responses from said one or more data sources (Nagatomo, col. 19, lines 7-19 and col. 19, line 59 – col. 20, line 15).

23. Claims 18-20, 25-26, and 31-32 are corresponding system and instruction claims containing the similar limitations as the methods described in claims 6-7 and 12-13; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2142

**Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chau Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-4639. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30am to 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Mark Powell, can be reached at (703) 305-9703.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application is assigned are as follows:

(703) 746-7238 (After Final Communications only)


(703) 746-7239 (Official Communications)

(703) 746-7240(for Official Status Inquiries, Draft Communications only)

Inquiries of a general nature relating to the general status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the 2100 Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Chau Nguyen  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2142

Marc Thompson  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2142

  
**MARK R. POWELL**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**GROUP 2400**